

Appl. No. **09 836 158**

Amdt. dated March 31, 2004

Reply to Office action mailed May 22, 2003

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant is submitting this Amendment with the status identifier "Previously presented" for the appropriate claims. In this Amendment, claim 16 is not amended.

The Amendment does not raise new issues. This Amendment would replace claim 15 with claim 29. Claim 21 is canceled for the purpose of expediting prosecution without prejudice to continuing prosecution of the claimed subject matter in a continuing application. No new matter would be added by entry of this amendment. Applicant requests entry of the amendment to reduce the issues on appeal.

## **Status of the Claims**

Claims 2 and 15 to 28 are pending and under consideration. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2, 16 to 20, and 22 to 29 would be pending for appeal.

## **Statement of the Rejections**

Claim 15 to 21, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite for the reasons set forth in the Final rejection.

Claims 2 and 15 to 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Cornwell. The reference discloses a fuel element in the form of a log having an external layer of aluminum particles wherein the preferred form of the log has a central bore, the walls of which are also coated with aluminum particles. The Examiner has taken the position that although Cornwell "does not specifically teach that the aluminum is a product for disintegrating a combustion deposit layer", the reference "suggests that no combustion deposits would form". The Examiner has also taken the position that Cornwell "teaches that the log contains a bore and whether it is formed during compression or after compression is not critical".

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Farjon. Upon entry of this amendment, claim 21 will be canceled.

Appl. No. 09 836 158

Amdt. dated March 31, 2004

Reply to Office action mailed May 22, 2003

**Applicants' Traversal**

Applicant again traverses the rejections and incorporates the arguments made in the Amendment filed March 3 herein by reference.

Applicants again submit that a review of the prior art of record as a whole shows that the claims in the present application meet the requirements for patentability. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider her rejections of the claims and allow claims 2, 16 to 20, and 22 to 29.

Respectfully submitted,

LEFEVRE

BY



Maria Parrish Tungol  
Registration No. 31,720  
Telephone: (202) 429-5249